

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed August 17, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully noted. From the Summary page, claims 1-6 were pending and indicated as rejected.

By this response, claim 1 has been amended and new claims 7-10 have been added. No statutory new matter has been added. All claim amendments are supported by the original disclosure.

New Claims 7-10

The features of new claims 7-10 positively recite the optional steps recited in claim 1. For reasons set forth below regarding amended claim 1, new claims 7-10 also patentably distinguish over the cited prior art references.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (a) as being anticipated by Haas (WO 03/049849). Claims 1 and 3 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kirchnerova, Jitka, Synthesis and Characterization of Perovskite Catalysts, Solid State Ionics 12 (1999) 307-317 (hereinafter Kirchnerova). Both rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants assert that neither Haas nor Kirchnerova anticipate amended claim 1¹. For a proper anticipation rejection, a single prior art reference must disclose each and every feature of the claimed invention. Haas or Kirchnerova does not teach claimed step (b) or a comparable step. Accordingly, there is no anticipation. Claim 3 depends upon claim 1. Since claim 1 is not anticipated, then neither is claim 3. Withdrawal of both rejections is requested.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 2, 4 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haas in view of Allison (US 6,723,886). Claims 2, 4 and 6 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirchnerova in view of Allison. Both rejections as to claims 2, 4 and 6 are respectfully traversed.

¹ Applicant's arguments in the response filed April 28, 2009 are incorporated by reference.

To one of ordinary skill in the art, Allison does not remedy the deficiencies of Haas and Kirchnerova with respect to step (b) recited in amended claim 1. That is, Haas and Kirchnerova do not teach or suggest a step where two salt solutions are combined to form a precipitant which is later analyzed. Moreover, Allison merely shows reaction vessels running in parallel surrounded by a cooling medium as suggested in the Office Action. Therefore, the obviousness rejection must fail. Withdrawal of both rejections is requested.

CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Therefore it is respectfully requested that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for all allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

It is not believed that extensions of time are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in accompanying documents. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to prevent abandonment of this application, then such extensions of time are hereby petitioned under 37 C.F.R. 1.136(a), and any fees required therefore are hereby authorized to be charged to **Deposit Account No. 02-4300, Attorney Docket No. 032301.458.**

Respectfully submitted,

SMITH, GAMBRELL & RUSSELL, LLP

By: _____

TB Patel
Tayan B. Patel, Reg. 58,402
1130 Connecticut Avenue; Ste 1130 NW
Washington DC 20036
Telephone: (202) 263-4300
Facsimile: (202) 263-4329

Date: January 15, 2010

TGW/TBP/lhb

SGRDC/349303.2